

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/927,259	08/13/2001	Kaoru Watanabe	Q65822	4313	
7590 07/30/2004			EXAMINER		
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC			SAGER, MARK ALAN		
2100 Pennsylva Washington, D	inia Avenue, N.W. C 20037		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
,			3714		
			DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	6 /(` ∶				
Advisory Action	09/927,259	WATANABE ET AL	•				
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit	:				
	M. A. Sager	3714					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 14 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		; ;				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the istatutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriate ex the final Office action; or	See MPEP te extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	:				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		:				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or	simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.				
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):		:				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			:				
Claim(s) allowed:			:				
Claim(s) objected to:			:				
Claim(s) rejected: 2,3 and 5-7.			:				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	: ;				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	7/14/2004/					
10. Other:		Nr. A. Sager Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3714					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: breadth of language fails to preclude Walker's suggestion to inhibit play. Essentially, Applicants read cliamed invention too narrowly by reading disclosure into claims. Reference cited on IDS was considered, as provided, and appears relevant for the selective display of content.